(1) (2) C.G. 1062

BEFORE THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH BILASPUR

(C.G.)

Dharam Chand Agrawal S/o Late
Hirala Agrawal aged 51 years
Occupation- Advocate
R/o – Begbahar Town
Dist.- Mahasamund (C.G.)

PETITIONER

Vs

1. Secretary- Ministry of Law Department
   D.K.S. Bhawan – Raipur (C.G.)

2. Collector and Secretary
   District Planning Organization
   Through Office of Collector
   Dist& P.O. – Mahasamund (C.G.)

3. Sri Raghunath Prasad Sharma
   Advocate and Notary – infront of
   Mahavari Bhawan – College road
   P.O. & Dist – Mahasamund (C.G.)

4. Hon'ble District and Secession Judge
   Through – Office of District Judge
   P.O. & District – Raipur (C.G.)

P. R. No. 1324/04 Presented by Shri R.K. Pandey dated 11-5-04

RESPONDENT

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

CERTIFIED COPY Bilaspur

(52)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1355/ **सन्** 2004

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	28.1.2005 Smt. Renu Kochar, counsel for the petitioner. Shri P.K. Verma, Additional Advocate General for the State. Heard both the counsel. The petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The main grievance of the petitioner is that decision on his application for appointment as Public Notary has not been conveyed to him as per sub-rule (2) of Rule 8 of Notaries Rules, 1956. The petitioner's case is that in response to government notification No.K.F/23-2/56 dated 15.11.1999 he has applied for the post of Public Notary for District Mahasamund. Along with petitioner 7-8 other persons have also applied for the said post and as per information of the petitioner on scrutiny his application was found defectless and ultimately the competent authority also recommended the name of the petitioner for the post of Public Notary. However, respondent No.2 had not issued license in favour of the petitioner to practice as Public Notary nor any decision has been communicated to him. Whereas, respondent No.2 appointed respondent No.3 as Public Notary on the said vacancy. It is true that as per provisions of Rule 8 (2) of Notaries Rules, 1956 it was the duty of appropriate government to inform the petitioner about the decision taken by the government on the application of the petitioner, which is admittedly not conveyed to the petitioner in the present case. Therefore, respondent No.1 is directed to convey the decision taken on the application of the petitioner within a period of thirty days from today. With the aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. **Sd/-** **L.C.BHADOO** **Judge**	

Roshan

Gr. PRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.